

AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS

Applicants submit herewith two sheets of replacement drawings amending Figures 3 and 4 of the present Application. The reference "330" has been added to Figure 3 for the Default IP Gateway as described in page 18, line 4, of the Specification. Figure 4 has been amended to show labels "Yes" and "No" for steps 420 and 430. No new matter has been added.

Amendments: Replacement Sheet for Figure 3;
 Replacement Sheet for Figure 4.

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are numbered 1-29. The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated February 23, 2005 have been carefully considered by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider and allow the remaining claims.

Drawings

The present Office Action objected to Figures 3 and 4. Specifically, Figure 3 fails to show the reference "330" for the Default IP Gateway as described in page 18, line 4, of the Specification. Also, Figure 4 fails to show the labels "Yes" and "No" for steps 420 and 430. Applicants have submitted herewith two sheets of replacement drawings amending Figures 3 and 4 of the present Application. The reference "330" has been added to Figure 3 for the Default IP Gateway. Also, Figure 4 has been amended to show labels "Yes" and "No" for steps 420 and 430. No new matter has been added. As such, Applicants respectfully contend that the amendments to Figures 3 and 4 overcome the Examiner's objections.

35 U.S.C. §103

The present Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11-14, 19-21, 23, 24, 27, and 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamaru et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,197) in view of Engwer et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0193895 A1). Claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamaru et al. in view of Engwer et al., and further in view of Sturniolo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,461). Further, Claims 3, 10, 15, 18, 22, and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamaru et al. in view of Engwer et al., and further in view of Forslow (U.S. Patent No. 6,608,832). Applicants have reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-29 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Kanamaru et al. reference taken alone or in combination with the Engwer et al., Sturniolo et al., and Forslow references.

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 20
Applicants respectfully point out that independent Claims 1, 11, and 20 recite that embodiments of the present invention include, in part:

from said AP, automatically sending said network status information for said AP without pre-notification to each of said plurality of clients when there is a change in said network

status of said AP, said plurality of clients coupled wirelessly to said AP . . .
(Emphasis Added)

The claimed embodiments of Claims 1, 11, and 20 pertain to methods of providing network connectivity and mobility for a roaming client. The present invention as claimed provides a method for an access point (AP) to send its own connection and network status information to a plurality of clients. More particularly, independent Claims 1, 11, and 20 of the present invention recite that network status information is sent to each of the plurality of clients without pre-notification whenever there is a change in network status of the AP.

Applicants respectfully note that the Kanamaru et al. reference taken alone or in combination with the Engwer et al. reference does not comprise nor suggest the present invention as claimed in which a network status of an AP is automatically monitored at the AP, and in which network status information for the AP is sent without pre-notification to each of a plurality of clients.

The Kanamaru et al. reference discloses a network monitoring device disposed at a node, a monitoring node, that is used to monitor the network connectivity of a remote, or neighboring node in the network. Applicants agree with the Examiner that the Kanamaru et al. reference fails to disclose monitoring network status of the AP at

the AP, and sending the network status information from the AP.

While the Engwer et al. reference was presented to overcome the shortcomings of failing to disclose monitoring network status at the AP and sending network status information from the AP, as detailed above, the Engwer et al. reference fails to disclose the sending of network status information without pre-notification when there is a change in the status of the AP. That is, the Engwer et al. reference discloses sending a DTIM message as a pre-notification message that indicates a data frame is to follow after a definitive time period has elapsed containing the network status information. As such, the combination of the Engwer et al. reference and the Kanamaru et al. references teach that network status information is sent along with a pre-notification message, which is in direct contrast to embodiments of the present invention in which network status information for the AP is sent without pre-notification to each of a plurality of clients whenever a change in network status of the AP is detected.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claims 1, 11, and 20 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Kanamaru et al. reference taken alone or in combination with the Engwer et al. reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In

addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-10, which depend from independent Claim 1, are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12-19, which depend from independent Claim 11, are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21-29, which depend from independent Claim 20, are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims for allowance thereof.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 6/23/05



John P. Wagner Jr.
Reg. No.: 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113